



IFW

PATENT
Customer No. 22,852
Attorney Docket No. 05225.0259

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:)
Tomohiro SATO et al.) Group Art Unit: 2825
Application No.: 10/770,520) Examiner: Caridad Everhart
Filed: February 4, 2004)
For: METHOD OF MANUFACTURING) Confirmation No.: 1739
SEMICONDUCTOR DEVICES)

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

**STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF
NOVEMBER 17, 2004 INTERVIEW WITH EXAMINER**

Applicants' undersigned representative scheduled and conducted a telephonic interview with the Examiner on November 17, 2004, and the Examiner faxed an Interview Summary form for this interview on the same day. Applicants again thank the Examiner for participating in the interview. Since Applicants submitted a response to the Office Action dated August 6, 2004 on October 29, 2004, Applicants file the following required statement which sets forth the substance of the interview conducted on November 17th. M.P.E.P. § 713.04, (8th ed., 2001).

During the interview, Applicants' representative presented reasoning establishing that the amendment to claims 1 and 6 had overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of Bashir et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,827,762 ("Bashir"), in view of Weiner, U.S. Patent no. 5,569,624 ("Weiner"), cited in the August 6, 2004 Office Action. Specifically, Applicants' representative emphasized that neither Bashir, nor Weiner, whether taken alone or in combination, teaches or suggests at least the element, "irradiating energy beams to

heat said silicide film so that ... [an] impurity is diffused to control a work function of said silicide film," as recited in amended claims 1 and 6.

Although the Examiner indicated that an updated search of the prior art was necessary, the Examiner's position was that the amendment to claims 1 and 6 had overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) to Bashir in view of Weiner. Thus, an agreement was reached between Applicants' representative and the Examiner.

Although an agreement was reached, Applicants reserve the right to present the reasoning discussed during the interview, as well as other reasoning demonstrating the patentability of the claims, in a future response, should the Examiner present this rejection in a future Office Action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this statement and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: December 6, 2004

By: 
Robert E. Converse, Jr.
Reg. No. 27,432